



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,111	01/10/2002	Richard Edmond Berry	AUS920010994US1	2389

7590

06/21/2004

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/045,111

Applicant(s)

BERRY, RICHARD EDMOND

Examiner

CamLinh Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 15, 20 – 22, 24 – 38, 43 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass et al (U.S. 6,253,204) in view of Jakob Nielsen (U.S. 6,658,662).

♦ As per claim 1, 8, 13, 20 – 22, 24, 31, 36, 43 – 45,

Glass et al discloses a method in a data processing system for pruning search engine indices, comprising:

- “Receiving a notification from a client browser that a Web page retrieval error occurred for a Web page or that the Web page no longer contains selected keywords” See Fig. 2 – 3, col. 4, lines 24 – col. 5, lines 20. In particular, Glass teaches that a user requests a document such as “document 1” from the Web. The request that contains “document 1” is inputted to the browser. Therefore, “document1” corresponds to a keyword. After that “document 2” is also another keyword, when the user tries to retrieve it. The user is notified if the file is not found, and the browser automatically generates a message to send to the server (fig. 3, step 340).

Art Unit: 2171

Glass does not clearly teach that the system will "automatically deleting the Web page from the search engine indices in response to receiving the notification". Glass teaches that the server will modify the broken link in order to restore the link.

However, Jakob Nielsen discloses a retrieving information system that allows a user view a website at a remote server (col. 8, lines 7 – 8). As seen in Fig. 4B, a URL list is generated and the system attempts to connect with a website server. The system has a capability of deleting the URL if an error occurs (col. 8, lines 65 – col. 9, lines 3). One with skill in the art would recognize that the list could be represented as an index in the search engine.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Glass by apply the teaching of Nielsen for deleting the web page if not found because the combination would reduce the time/cost searching for other user in later time.

♦ As per claim 2, 9, 25, 32,

- " The step of automatically deleting is initiated if the notification results in a minimum number of notifications being received for the Web page" See Fig. 10, col. 6, lines 62 – col. 7, lines 4, Fig. 12A – B, col. 7, lines 13 - 48 of Glass.

♦ As per claim 3, 10, 26, 33, 37,

- " Receiving a search request from the client browser, wherein the search request contains the selected keywords" See Fig. 2, element 200, col.4, lines 25 – 35, Glass.

- " Searching the search engine indices for matches to the selected keywords to form a search" See Fig. 2, element 210 – 20, Glass.
- " Sending a result of the search to the client browser" See Fig. 2, element 240, Glass.

♦ As per claim 4, 27,

- " The search result includes an indication that the data processing system includes a search engine to cause the client browser to send the notification to the data processing system" See Fig. 2, element 260, Fig. 3, Glass.

♦ As per claim 5, 28,

- " The search request includes other keywords in addition to the selected keywords" See Fig. 2 of Glass. The request that includes document 1 is an example of keywords. The document 1, may contains hypertext that identifies another document. This hypertext is also considered as another keyword that included in the search request.

♦ As per claim 6, 11, 14, 29, 34,

- " The retrieval error indicates that the Web page is absent" See col. 4, lines 40 – 55, Glass.

♦ As per claim 7, 12, 15, 30, 35, 38,

- " The method is located in one of a search engine or a Web portal" See Fig. 1D, Glass.

3. Claims 16 – 19, 23, 39 – 42, 46, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass et al (U.S. 6,253,204) in view of Jakob Nielsen (U.S.

6,658,662) as applied to claims 1 - 15 above, and further in view of Li et al (U.S. 6,631,496).

♦ As per claim 16, 23, 39, 46

The combination of Glass and Nielsen fails to disclose a system for managing a set of bookmarks for browser. However, it is well known in the art, that a user can bookmark an URL for querying in the future. An example is provided by Li et al. Li discloses a system for personalizing and managing web information that includes a hypermedia database for managing bookmark, which allows a user to organize hypertext documents for querying (see the abstract of Li).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to bookmark an URL for later use because it allows the user the capability of managing favorite information without remember it.

♦ As per claim 17 - 19, 40 – 42,

Claims 17 – 19, 40 – 42, are rejected based on the rejection of claims 2 and 9.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Goerz, Jr. et al (US 20020065671A1) discloses a method and system for project customized business-to-business development with indexed knowledge base.
- Morgenthaler et al (US 20020032677A1) discloses a method for creating, editing, and updating searchable graphical database and databases of graphical images

and information and displaying graphical images from a searchable graphical database or databases in a sequential or slide show format.

- Knoesel et al (US 20030084143A1) discloses a resource locator management system and method.
- Fogg et al (US006321242B1) discloses a re-linking technology for a moving web site.
- Lal (US 20030158953A1) discloses a protocol to fix broken links on the World Wide Web.
- Huang et al (US006611835B1) discloses a system and method for maintaining up-to-date link information in the metadata repository of a search engine.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is 305-1951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/045,111

Page 7

Art Unit: 2171

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LN


WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER